

interest stories. We could change the names a little and locate the stories in the province of Saskatchewan, in Quebec, in the state of Georgia, in England, or anywhere in the world. All that needs to be changed in these stories to make them Canadian is a line or two and immediately they would become home grown in Canada, but in fact they have come from another part of the world. More than the articles in *Time*, the articles in *Reader's Digest* represent varying viewpoints from around the world.

So far as Canadianization is concerned, certainly *Reader's Digest* is more international than *Time* and the other two periodicals mentioned, *MD Canada* and *Modern Medicine*. Essentially we are getting rid of a news magazine, namely, *Time*. Personally I was not much interested in *Time*, particularly the Canadian edition. Obviously *Time* magazine feels in Canada as a guest who has to behave himself and has to write nice things about Canada. However, *Time* was a window on the world. U.S. magazines have much greater access to people scattered throughout the world and the events that are happening. No Canadian magazine could equal them. There are some very obvious reasons for that.

Some people thought that if we suddenly put *Time* out of business, a lot of money and many Canadian writers would become available. In fact, in any population there is only a small number of people who can write, the news people and the media people. Canada has approximately 15 million English speaking people, whereas the United States have 200 million. Most people in western Canada are much more interested in events across the border than in what *Maclean's* writes about. *Maclean's* writes about Toronto, about Bloor and Jarvis Streets and about the lake front. This is as uninteresting to most western Canadians as it is uninteresting to Quebecers. This does not mean that they are against anything being written about Toronto, but they are more interested in reading what happens south of the border.

● (2050)

To say that *Maclean's*, as the obvious beneficiary of this legislation, will become a newsmagazine, seems to be stretching the realm of the possible. Many of its articles seem quite risqué. Sometimes I think the magazine should be sold under the counter as other pornographic and risqué magazines are—though in fact some are being shown over the counter now.

We can get rid of *Time*, as the government obviously wants to, but will it have the desired result? *Canadian Geographic* magazine is a quarter the size of the *National Geographic* but it is more expensive. Canadian magazines are seriously disadvantaged and you have to be really patriotic to support many of them. There are some good articles in them but it is doubtful whether they will be able to probe the larger issues as do the American magazines. Canadians like to read American magazines, and this is partly because Canadian magazines spend so much of their time telling us that we should be good Canadians, just as the CBC spends a lot of time telling us that we are polluting the atmosphere. Sometimes you feel guilty to be alive. Much Canadian writing is directed along similar lines.

Non-Canadian Publications

The advertising in *Maclean's* magazine is pretty well divided into four groups—liquor, tobacco, travel and cars. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) tells us that alcohol and tobacco are major health problems, but the advertising revenue comes largely from the four areas I have mentioned.

I think it can be fairly said that alcohol is a serious problem. I do not often agree with the premier of my province who is a member of the NDP, but when he says there is too much emphasis on liquor advertising I am inclined to think he is on a good wicket, as the English would say. And what about automobiles? We are told that their use will diminish in the future so that factor will reduce advertising in the magazines and periodicals. Travel will also be reduced if the dire forecasts of energy shortages prove to be correct.

It does not logically follow that the advertising dollars which presently go to *Time* will automatically go to Canadian periodicals when it leaves the country, nor is it certain they would be able to use them. Will they be able to produce writing of the same standard? I notice that CP Air advertises in *Newsweek* magazine. Presumably this is not deductible. CP Air is a Canadian company obviously attempting to attract American travellers.

I should like to say that I support the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) and agree with her wholeheartedly.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Madam Speaker, I should like to say a few words in support of the excellent amendment put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt). I do so as one who participated in the examination of this bill when it was before the committee, and I also participated in this debate when the bill was before the House.

It is interesting that we should reflect tonight on the fact that the vote at second reading stage of this bill was only reached when the government imposed closure. Even after the imposition of closure two prominent supporters of the government voted against the bill. I refer to the hon. member for Montreal-Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), who unfortunately is not in his seat, and the hon. member for Kitchen (Mr. Flynn).

When the bill went to committee, notwithstanding the tremendous interest there was in the legislation, we as a committee found ourselves again operating under the constraint of closure. The very first move the government made was to impose closure on the time of the committee. We were in fact given approximately one month to examine the bill and the many witnesses who had signified their intention of appearing and giving evidence.

I should like to speak on one aspect of the experience of this bill that was dealt with by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway in her speech last Thursday, and again in her intervention on Friday last. In my experience in this House, and in participating in committees of this House, I have never seen the government impose such rigid discipline on its members, actually denying members the right to participate in the examination of this bill as it did with its own members when the bill was before committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!